

The use of oral corrective feedback in 7th grade students' speaking skills at SMPN 2 Rajabasa Lampung Selatan

Ikram Ibadillah Pasha¹, Feni Munifatullah², Fajar Riyantika³

Universitas Lampung, Jl. Prof. Dr. Soemantri Brojonegoro No.1, Bandar Lampung^{1,2,3}

¹Correspondence e-mail: 1

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research was to find out whether any significant improvement in students' speaking skills after being given by oral corrective feedback. This research was quantitative-research and used one group pretest-posttest design as the method. The population of this research was the first grade students of SMPN 2 Rajabasa Lampung Selatan in the academic year 2022/2023. The sample of this research was in class VII which consisted of 26 students. In collecting the data, the researcher used speaking test and the data were analyzed using SPSS Program. The result showed that there was statistically significant improvement of students' speaking skills after receiving Oral Corrective Feedback with the significant level 0.00 less than 0.005. Therefore, it can be concluded that oral corrective feedback can assist students in improving their speaking skills.

Keywords: *oral corrective feedback, speaking skills, descriptive text.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Speaking is very important as it is the most common skill used when communicating messages and exchanging information. But, many students still believe that speaking skill is the most difficult skill. The students did not want to speak English, therefore only a few people actively participated in the speaking activity. Most of them were embarrassed and didn't have the courage to take the risk if they had a speech disorder. They seem to have been worried about making mistakes. (Harmer, 2007) argued that if learners make mistakes, they cannot correct them and need some explanation. The role of the teacher is very important because EFL learners find it very difficult to acquire speaking skills.

For this reason, teachers need to guide learners to acquire speaking skills as a contributor to student success. Certainly, Errors allow learners to confirm their hypotheses and actively contribute to language development. Thereupon, (Harmer, 2007) argued that mistakes are part of the natural acquisition process. He also claimed that error categories have the greatest impact on teachers. Therefore, the teacher can help the learner correct errors by providing feedback on speaking performance.

According to (Neals, 2015), several types of feedback include oral and written feedback, evaluative and descriptive feedback, informal and formal feedback, and peer and self-feedback. In most speaking classes, professors, instructors, or lecturers deliver

oral feedback. Oral feedback can be classified into three types: corrective feedback (R Lyster & Ranta, 1997), evaluative feedback (Gattalo, 2000), and descriptive feedback (Askew, 2000). Oral feedback is commonly used by teachers/lecturers in speaking classes (Lyster, Saito, & Sato, 2013).

Corrective feedback is a type of negative feedback. (Ellis, 2009) claims that corrective feedback is in the form of responding to learners' comments about language errors. Another expert, (Iliana & Lyster, 2002) defines corrective feedback as a reaction from a teacher who changed significantly and needed to improve student pronunciation. Another expert, (Hattie & Timperley, 2007) argues that corrective feedback focuses on effective construction processes and self-regulation. Therefore, corrective feedback is called negative feedback to correct the language mistakes made by the student.

Researchers have discovered the benefits of student feedback. Oral or written feedback, or both, is a vehicle to help students improve their future performance. (Hussein & Ali, 2014), (Kirgoz & Agcam, 2015), and (Voerman et al, 2012) all said that feedback can be used to improve language learning and recognize how learners misspell their target language. In other words, feedback is provided in response to learners making mistakes in using the target language. This answer, either explicitly or implicitly, shows that students' statements in the target language are in some way incorrect. For example, it could be a correction of pronunciation or grammar, or it could be a lexical error, a syntax error, or a structural error. Therefore, no resume at the end of the speech.

According to Hunt and Touzel (2009), providing feedback is a way to manage the students' language use in class. There are various reasons why teachers must provide feedback on their students' speaking skills. For starters, teachers' feedback can help students better comprehend their mistakes in speaking presentations. Second, when a student is corrected, they have a better knowledge of how to utilize the language target and realize how to improve their speaking performance in future performances. Finally, teachers' feedback can increase students' confidence since they know they can rely on the teacher to double-check their responses. In this situation, the teacher assists students in providing feedback to fix their errors while also managing their incorrect language use in speaking performance. It greatly aids students in improving their learning development.

Based on the explanation of the problem above, the researcher conducted a study entitled "The use of oral corrective feedback in 7th grade students' speaking skills at SMPN 2 Rajabasa Lampung Selatan". This research is to assist English teachers to improve students' English speaking skills and help the students achieve the goal of learning English.

II. METHODS

The researcher employed Pre-Experimental Research in this study. The experimental group was employed in the pre-experimental study. The students' improvement in speaking after being given Oral Corrective Feedback is the focus of this study's pre-experimental group. In this study, the researcher provided a pre-test to students before providing treatment for speaking through Oral Corrective Feedback. The researcher gave several examples of descriptive video in class, and then students retold the

example based on their own words. Following treatment, the researcher provided a post-test to the students. The population of this research was the first-grade students of SMPN 2 Rajabasa Lampung Selatan and for the sample of this research was the students of VII A class which consist of 26 number of students. The researcher used purposive sampling in determining the sample. Therefore, this study utilized one class where the researcher chose class VII A as the sample in this study because VII A was a top class and had a higher quality in terms of learning motivation compared to other classes. The researcher got the data from the speaking test as the instrument of the test, in order to measure their speaking skills. The tests were measured by using scoring system of speaking. Then, the data were analyzed by using Paired Sample T-test in SPSS 26 for Windows.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Results

The pre-test and the post-test then were conducted in VII A class of SMPN 2 Rajabasa Lampung Selatan in order to analyzed how the significant improvement in students' speaking skills after being given by oral corrective feedback. The frequency distribution of the pre-test and the post-test can be seen in the table below:

Table 1. The distribution of students' scores in the pre-test.

Interval	Frequency	Percent	Median	The Lowest Score	The Highest Score	Average Score
0 – 30	11	42.3	34.3	22.5	62.5	35.5
31 – 50	11	42.3				
51 – 70	4	15.3				
71 – 80	0	0				
81 – 100	0	0				
Total	26	100%	34.3	22.5	62.5	35.5

Table 2. The distribution of students' scores in the post-test

Interval	Frequency	Percent	Median	The Lowest Score	The Highest Score	Average Score
0 – 30	0	0	71.25	70.5	79.2	72.2
31 – 50	0	0				
51 – 70	9	34.6				
71 – 80	17	65.3				
81 – 100	0	0				
Total	26	100%	71.25	70.5	79.2	72.2

In order to answer the research question, the researcher conducted the pre-test and post-test on students of VII A class of SMPN 2 Rajabasa Lampung Selatan. Based on the

data computation, it was found that there was an improvement of students' pre-test and post-test score which the result of pre-test and post-test were described as follows:

Table 3. The students' score improvements in pre-test and post-test

Pre-Test Average Score (PrS)	Post-Test Average Score (PoS)	Average Score Improvement (PoS – Prs)
35.5	72.2	36.7

Based on to the data table above, it shows that the students' speaking skills was increased after being given by oral corrective feedback. The mean score of pre-test which 35.5 and the mean score of post-test which 72.2, indicated there was improvement between students' mean score of pre-test and post-test after being given by oral corrective feedback.

In order to prove whether the hypothesis proposed by the researcher was accepted or not, hypothesis testing was conducted. The researcher used Paired Sample T-test to test the hypothesis.

Paired Samples Test								
Paired Differences								
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Pre-test Post-test	-36.72115	10.43392	2.04626	40.93550	32.506803	17.9455	5	.000

Table 4. The significance different between pre-test and post-test

Table above shows that the significant level was 0.00 and it was lower than the alpha level ($0.00 < 0.05$). Therefore, it could be concluded that the research hypothesis (H1) was accepted; since there was an improvement in the students' speaking skills after being given by oral corrective feedback.

Discussions

This section intended to discuss the research findings, referring to the research questions. The purpose of this study was to find out whether there was a significant improvement in students' speaking skills before and after the treatment using oral corrective feedback.

The researcher gave corrective feedback on each incorrect word or sentence spoken by the students based on the guidelines and methods or types of corrective feedback

strategies in the theory. However, the researcher only used recast and clarification request. Recast and clarification request techniques encourage students to correct their own mistakes, prompting them to think critically about language use and develop problem-solving skills. Both techniques are more natural and less intrusive than other feedback techniques, which can sometimes disrupt the flow of conversation and make students feel self-conscious which means less intimidating. According to the technique of corrective feedback used by the researcher, adapted from Ellis (2009): The recast is when the teacher integrates the immediately preceding inaccurate utterance's content words, modifies, and corrects the utterances in some formulations. Whereas, the clarification request is when the teacher reflects that he or she did not understand what the student stated. Therefore, in some way, a repetition or a reformulation of a student's utterance is required.

In providing corrections to errors produced by students. Researcher provided corrections to student errors using the recast and clarification request technique:

a. Recast

Recast is when the teacher integrates the immediately preceding inaccurate utterance's content words, modifies, and corrects the utterances in some formulations (Ellis, 2006). In this situation, the teachers state the right form of the words or sentences without mentioning that they are incorrect. The following examples of recast feedback:

Student : It leves on teh ladend

Teacher : Do you mean that Horse, It lives on the land, right?

b. Clarification Request

The teacher reflects that he or she did not understand what the student stated (Ellis, 2009). Therefore, in some way, a repetition or a reformulation of student's utterance is required. The following examples of clarification request feedback:

Student : Itch his kolorful fetehrs and two legez

Teacher : Oh sorry, I don't understand, Can you repeat it?

However, if the student still made the same mistake, then the researcher would respond with a recast, "It has colorful feathers and two legs". The researcher used one of these techniques in correcting students' errors. However, the researcher can use both feedback techniques, if needed. Then, the researcher still found some errors produced by the pronunciation of some other students and corrected them using the recast and clarification request techniques.

There are three previous studies related to the use of oral corrective feedback to improve students' speaking skills. The first study is conducted by Rahmawati (2019). The data were analyzed by comparing the students' mean scores between the experimental class and the control class. The result of this research showed that the students' mean score of the experimental class (who were taught by Corrective Feedback Strategy) is 63.068. While the students' mean score of the control class (who were not taught by using

Corrective Feedback Strategy) is 57. The result of the research showed that the results test was 3.283 and value of t_{table} with $df = 31$ was 2.04. It means that the value of t_{test} was higher than t_{table} ($3.283 > 2.04$). So, H_0 was accepted. It can be concluded that there was a significant improvement scores in speaking skills for the students who were taught by Corrective Feedback strategy and those who were not taught by Corrective Feedback Strategy. Lead to the conclusion that the corrective feedback strategy is appropriate enough to be used in teaching productive skills in order to improve one class of students in terms of speaking achievement. There are some differences between Rahmawati's research and this research. Rahmawati's research used a corrective feedback strategy to improve speaking skills and to compare the student's mean scores difference between the experimental class and control class. Besides that, this research used oral corrective feedback to improve speaking in only one class pretest and posttest.

The second previous study is conducted by Nurhartanto (2018), The first result found that generally, corrective feedback contributed to students and increased the students' speaking performance. Second, it was found that concrete learners gained more benefit from corrective feedback than the other learning styles while the authority-oriented learners gained very little or did not get any benefits from corrective feedback. The third result showed that from the use of recast, the students were able to make 87.8% of repairing the errors that they made. The percentage of no uptake or no immediate response after the feedback was given was only 0.048%. On the other hand, from the use of clarification requests, the percentage of repaired sentences was only 33.3% while the percentage of unrepaired sentences was 53.85%. It can be concluded that the student gets the improvement in their speaking skills after being given oral corrective feedback and the effectiveness of corrective feedback might depend on the student's personal character, in this case, on their learning style. But, there are still differences between Nurhatanto's research and this research. In this research, the researcher only finds out a significant improvement in students' speaking skills. Moreover, the researcher does not compare oral corrective feedback with other learning styles and does not find out whether the effectiveness of corrective feedback might be depended on the student's learning styles.

The third previous study is conducted by Muyashoha (2019), the research's result indicated that the students' perception toward oral corrective feedback is positive. All of the indicators show a good point that most students agree to receive oral corrective feedback from their teacher. Additionally, it is obviously answered that using oral corrective feedback in speaking learning class is effective in improving the students' speaking ability. These findings could contribute to a better understanding of how the teacher should give oral corrective feedback when the students make some errors in the classroom. In conclusion, it will provide a better comprehension by relating and comparing the students' perception and the lecturers' perception of oral error corrective feedback for further researchers. Similar to this research, this research was able to prove that giving oral corrective feedback is effective in improving student's speaking skills, but the difference between this study and Muyashoha's study is that the researcher did not discuss students' perceptions of corrective feedback given by the teacher. However, the researcher used corrective feedback as a learning style in the learning process.

In this research, students showed their best performance and ability during pretest and posttest. After getting treatment, the students' speaking ability became better than before. The students were improving in speaking skills because during the treatment researcher used oral error correction technique based on (Ellis, 2006). To make sure that the students were getting improvement, there are several examples of students' improvement in their speaking skills in all of four aspects of speaking, such as:

1. Pronunciation, the researcher found some errors in students' pronunciation such as the words cat and has which should be pronounced /kæt/ and /hæs/. But, some students pronounced /cAt/ and /hAs/, this was because they pronounced these words based on their first language. However, after the treatment, the students' pronunciation improved. The students were able to pronounce the words with good and correct pronunciation. This happened because the researcher used recasts and clarification requests to correct their performance during the treatment. So, the students' pronunciation became better after getting two treatments.

2. Comprehension, the researcher found that students' comprehension was still insufficient, for example, they were unable to receive the point of the question or unable to express their ideas in answering the question properly. Some students did not even know what the meaning of the questions asked by the researcher. For example, when the researcher asked the simple question "Can you describe these animals based on the pictures?", some of students could not answer the question, but there was one student who responded in Bahasa, "*Bapak ngomong apa sih?*", This proves that students' understanding was still relatively low. It changed after two treatments. Although the students could answer the researcher's questions, not all of them did so with appropriate pronunciation, grammar, and fluency. But, it still indicated that the students' comprehension has improved.

3. Grammar, the researcher found that students made grammatical errors in a few simple words in the sentences, for example, some of the students used (to be) "are" and (verb) "have" not "is" and "has" in the singular subject, or students used "is" which should be "has" in the pretest. For example, "It is brown color". After getting treatment, the student knew that he was wrong and said "It has blue color" in the posttest activity. The improvement occurred because the teacher used the recast technique during the learning process.

4. Fluency, some students encountered a lot of difficulties in speaking fluently. For example, speaking repetitively, too many speaking delays, being inaudible, stuttering, and cluttering. This indicated that the cause of the problem in each aspect was also influenced by the students' lack of English knowledge and was still influenced by their first language. For example, "It is a cat, It is aaa (inaudible)", another example, "It is a dog four legs". After the students got treatment by using clarification requests, the sentence changed to "It is a cow, It has big body" (without any doubt). Thus, This proves that students' fluency has improved after the treatment.

In the end, the explanation above led us to the conclusion that providing Oral Corrective Feedback in the learning process improves the speaking skills of students. Oral corrective feedback offers both advantage and disadvantage. The advantage of focusing

on oral correction was the way to raise students' awareness of linguistic precision as well as the precision of language meaning. The disadvantage was that oral correction could be distracting and divert students' attention and concentration when they were speaking language utterances and ideas. Corrections, on the other hand, should not necessarily be delivered at the end of the lesson.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

Based on the results of the study, there is a significant improvement in students' speaking skills after receiving Oral Corrective Feedback. This is because feedback creates something engaging for the teacher and is helpful thing for the students in the teaching-learning process. In terms of the feedback given, feedback tends to be given personally to students. This lets students know what they have achieved and what to improve in learning.

The researcher found that the students' speaking skills have improved. This is indicated by the students' pronunciation which is getting better and is no longer affected by their first language. The students' comprehension also improved, they could understand and provide ideas to answer the questions well. The students have made fewer grammatical errors and can use better sentence structures than before. Students' fluency in speaking has also improved from before although there are still some difficulties. This proves that oral corrective feedback can play an important role in improving students' speaking skills.

Suggestions

1. Suggestions for English teachers: The teachers should use any learning variations such as methods, techniques, or strategies. Thus, students can get excited about learning, they can be more focused on learning, and the more learning variations a teacher provides, the more fun learning can be. Therefore, teachers can give oral corrective feedback directly when teaching their students because teachers can correct the students' speaking as best as possible. So, students can immediately know any mistakes they have made. The teachers should often familiarize students with exercise and communication activities in English while learning the language. This has many benefits for students, one of which aims to assist in building confidence in their verbal skills in the future.

2. Suggestion for students: In improving English speaking consistently, especially after receiving oral corrective feedback, students should establish a proactive approach. Students can start by recording their own pronunciation to identify shortcomings that need improvement, focusing on pronunciation and specific aspects of the language. Therefore, students should join conversation groups, find language exchange partners, or utilize English learning apps that offer opportunities for practice and immediate feedback. Students can also improve their English speaking skills by reading aloud, role-playing various scenarios, speaking in front of a mirror, and watching English movies or TV shows. This can improve fluency and naturalness in speaking. Students

need to set clear language goals, seek professional guidance if needed, and regularly review feedbacks are important steps toward continuous improvement. Finally, students need to accept mistakes as part of the learning process and consistently expand their vocabulary which will help them to build confidence and proficiency in speaking English.

3. Suggestion for further researcher: This research still has some shortcomings, so it is possible for future researchers to get other latest advantages of oral corrective feedback on speaking skills, discover new ideas from this research source, and compile research with the next level of development. The researcher hopes that this research can help future researchers who take the same research discussion.

REFERENCES

- Arikunto. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta : PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Askew, S. (2000). *Feedback for Learning*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group.
- Brookhart. (2008). *How to Give Effective Feedback to Your Students*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (2nd.Ed.). New York: Pearson Education.
- Corder, S. P. (1967). The Significance of Learners' Errors. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 5(4), 161-170.
- Ellis, R. (2009). Corrective Feedback and Teacher. *L2 Journal*, 3-18.
- Ellis, R., Loewen, S., & Erlam, R. (2006). Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 339-368.
- Gattalo, F. (2000). Formative Assessment in ELT primary (Elementary) Classroom: An Italian Case Study. *Language Testing*, 17(2), 278-288.
- Gay, L.R. (1981). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and application in Eighth edition*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching (4th Edition) (Longman Handbooks for Language Teachers)*. Cambridge: Pearson Longman.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The Power of Feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 81-112.
- Heaton. J. B. (1988). *Writing English Language Tests*. New york: Longman Inc New york Press.
- Hunt, G., & Timothy, J. T. (2009). *Effective Teaching: Preparation and Implementation*. Illinois: Charles C Thomas Publisher.
- Hussein, B. A., & Ali, H. I. (2014). Rationalizing Oral Corrective Feedback in Sudanese EFL Classrooms. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 217-231.
- Iliana, P., & Lyster, R. (2002). Patterns of Corrective Feedback and. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 573-595.
- Kirgoz, Y., & Agcam, R. (2015). Teachers' Perceptions On Corrective Feedback In Turkish Primary . *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 574-581.
- Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2004). *How Language are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake: Negotiation of Form in Communicative Classrooms. *Studied in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37–66.
- Lyster, Roy, Saito, K., & Sato, M. (2013). Oral Corrective Feedback in Second Language Classroom. *Journal Cambridge Language Teaching*, 46(1), 1–40.
- Muyashoha, A. B. (2019). *The Students' Perception Toward Oral Corrective Feedback in Speaking Class at English Department of IAIN Palangka Raya*. Palangka Raya: IAIN Palangka Raya.
- Nurhartanto, A. (2018). *The Effect of Corrective Feedback towards Students' Speaking Performance Related to Learning Styles*. Lampung: Universitas Lampung.
- BIBLIOGRAPHY Rahmawati, S. F. (2019). *The Effectiveness of Corrective Feedback Strategy to Students' Speaking Skill of The Eight Grade Students at Smpn 2 Jetis Ponorogo in Academic Year 2018/2019*. Ponorogo: IAIN Ponorogo.
- Tower, S. L. (1999). *Reactions to negative feedback: The influence of goal orientation, self -efficacy, and public or private feedback delivery on task choice and changes in self -efficacy*. Michigan: Michigan State University.
- Voerman, L., Meijer, P. C., Korthagen, F. A. J., & Simons, R. J. (2012). Types and Frequencies of Feedback Interventions in Classroom Interaction in Secondary Education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(8), 1-9