CHAPTER IV

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. Result

The interview and observation techniques were executed to get data of oral corrective feedback. These data collected from the respondents were analyzed by the researcher. Interview technique was used to investigate teachers’ perceptions of oral corrective feedback by delivering open-ended interview to deepen the information to the respondents. Observation was also conducted in teachers’ learning process which permits the researcher to record the data. It was to describe the implementation of oral corrective feedback in teaching and learning process.

1. Interview results

The findings of interview were obtained from 6 teachers as respondent. There were 8 basic questions used by the researcher to investigate their perceptions of oral corrective feedback. Those questions asked about the roles, the strategies and the timings of oral corrective feedback to the respondents. Each of them was collected by recording the respondents’ interview.

Furthermore, all of interview data were analyzed by adopting Miles and Huberman technique by following three steps: data reduction, data display, and conclusion. Those included:
a. The roles

There were 3 questions to investigate the respondents about this topic. The respondents assumed there were 3 targets influenced by oral corrective feedback in teaching and learning process. Oral corrective feedback had roles for students, teacher and language learning. As following explanations below:

1. For students

The respondents had various perceptions that oral corrective feedback was very important to their students. Many roles of oral corrective feedback were for students. As T1’s response below:

“Firstly, it is to measure the depth of the students’ understanding. Secondly, it is to encourage students’ motivation for being active because teacher actually should push their thought in analyzing errors and ask them to express the solution after.”

These findings proved there were 2 roles of oral corrective feedback for the students: to measure the depth of the students’ understanding with the concept and to encourage students’ motivation for being active. T3 added the roles as T1 assumed. These included:

“Correction is for all students. Error comes from a student. It also has to be shared in the class. It will help them to solve their difficulty because actually not only one student does this error and has difficulty, but the other students certainly have similar difficulty.”
T3 assumed that oral corrective feedback can solve the students’ difficulty by sharing feedback for all of students in order to set out their attention.

The other finding was also found when the researcher investigated T4 below:

“It is to underline where the errors and the correct one are. It explains the errors and the correct form so that the students are helped in maximizing their understanding.”

Oral corrective feedback was to emphasize the errors and explain the correct form. It stimulated the students to maximize their understanding the concept of English in written or spoken. As following response below:

“It is very important to improve their understanding the concept of English in written or spoken.”

T5 had a notion that oral corrective feedback would improve their understanding the concept of English in written or spoken. There were additional perceptions from T2’s explanation below:

“I think it is better to use oral corrective feedback because it can encourage the students’ motivation to produce English appropriately.”

T2 stated that it would naturally happen when the students understood the concept of the teachers’ correction well they
would be motivated to produce English appropriately. T6 added the previous perceptions as follows:

“It is very important because I am sure English is a foreign language to be used and heard by them. Because of corrective feedback, they will be motivated to speak well and to write correctly.”

As a result, there are many roles of oral corrective feedback for students’ improvement in learning English, those are: 1) to measure the depth of students’ understanding, 2) to encourage students’ motivation for being active in learning English, 3) to find out and solve the students’ difficulty, 4) to maximize the students’ understanding with the concept, and 5) to encourage students’ motivation to produce English appropriately.

2. For teacher

The respondents asserted oral corrective feedback had various roles for boosting their expertise as corrector. The first benefit was to encourage their ability in providing feedback for the students’ errors. As T3 assumed below:

“It also improves teacher’s ability in teaching and learning as corrector. So there will be progress and development from the teacher as well.”

This respondent believed oral corrective feedback boosted their ability how to correct the students’ errors effectively. Then, she also believed it could influence for teacher’s progress and
development as well. Actually, T1 had similar perception of those roles. These included:

“For me, oral corrective feedback can encourage me to deepen my knowledge in English and how to correct their error effectively.”

T5 also assumed that:

“Of course, it develops the teacher’s ability in correcting appropriately to the student. It also boosts the teacher’s utterance. When the feedback continuously happens in the class, it also becomes a feedback for the teacher.”

Those respondents also stated oral corrective feedback improved their experiences in providing feedback for students. This experience supported their expertise as corrector. As T2 and T4’s responses below:

“It is very helpful for teacher to boost their experience in giving feedback and actually as a corrector or evaluator.”

“It will develop the teacher’s experience as corrector.”

Oral corrective feedback also improved the teacher’s awareness and carefulness as corrector. They had to be aware some factors coming from students before they decided to give feedback for responding their errors. As T6 stated below:

“Corrective feedback is a way to encourage teacher’s carefulness when they give correction. They have to be wiser corrector furthermore when the students continuously do errors.”
It explained that teacher had to be aware the students’ psychology. Hence, the students could achieve their corrective feedback easily.

Briefly, oral corrective feedback has beneficial roles for developing teacher’s expertise which improves the teacher’s ability, experience, and awareness as corrector.

3. Language learning

Dealing with the findings, the researcher analyzed language accuracy and fluency naturally improved when oral corrective feedback are applied in EFL classroom. According to the teachers’ perceptions, language learning is divided into:

a. Language accuracy

The respondents assumed oral corrective feedback could improve language accuracy from the students. It was proved from findings of T4’s response below:

“Automatically, it will influence the students’ language accuracy. If they get the right concept continuously, they will better in understanding English.”

He stated that language accuracy would improve when the students got the clear concept continuously from the teacher’s correction. T2 also assumed similar perception about language accuracy below:

“Language will develop certainly when the teacher and students have a good concept of language
especially English. Hence, language accuracy will develop well.”

b. Language fluency

Some respondents stated oral corrective feedback had a role for developing language fluency. They assumed when the students regularly respond feedback from their errors they would improve their understanding with the concept, automatically they also could produce English fluently. As T1’s response below:

“As corrective feedback given to the students, it can influence their fluency in English. They will be supported many concepts of English from oral corrective feedback.”

There were additional findings from T6’s perception. These included:

“It automatically will influence their fluency of English. Their utterance will naturally develop along with oral corrective feedback given in the class.”

There was similar perception that the students’ understanding of the concept of correction is a basic point for improving language fluency from T3 as follows:

“The understanding with the concept of correction will influence their language fluency, because grammar will be good and the pronunciation as well.”

Another respondent believed that students’ fluency will be improved when the teacher provided clear correction
so that the students understood the concept easily. T5’s responded:

“Theyir fluency will be naturally improved when the teacher regularly gives clear correction so that the students regularly produce the correct concept.”

Actually, those are their perceptions of roles of oral corrective feedback which naturally commits in teaching and learning process.

b. Strategy

The findings of this topic were obtained by delivering 3 basic questions to the respondents. The respondents described 2 strategies in providing effective oral corrective feedback.

1. Giving-answer strategy

Oral corrective feedback was provided by giving the target form directly and only indicating the location of errors. Without any stimulus and indicated questions, the corrector gave the correct form directly for responding students’ errors. As findings in T5’s interview below:

“I correct their errors by giving the target form and ask them to repeat what I say and ask them to clarify what I write.”

In this response, T5 provided the target form for correcting their students’ errors in the class because she believed this strategy could habituate them to hear and say English regularly in correcting English. These included:
"I believe when they often hear and try to speak with English in correct concept, they will naturally have good English."

The basic reason was to encourage them to hear and produce English regularly covered by teacher’s corrective feedback.

In the other findings, the other respondent also assumed giving correct form in facing new errors which the students recently produce and recognize. T4 stated those errors naturally occurred in EFL classroom moreover when the teachers teach new material. As following response of T4 below:

"I will give direct correction when they do errors in recognizing new words or new materials. I am sure it is effective for covering their errors in understanding. This error naturally happens because they are still progressing to recognize English well."

Thus, there were some reasons when teachers wanted to apply this strategy. Those were for habituating the students to hear and produce English regularly by covering teacher’s feedback and for facing new errors in new concept of material.

There was additional perception explained by T2 as follows:

"I will give the correct form when they find difficult words/concepts or new words in process of activity."
A lot of errors occurred in teaching practice appointed the teachers to apply oral corrective feedback. T2 stated to give the correct form when students started to find out difficult words/concepts in recognizing new words.

2. Prompting-answer strategy

In teaching and learning process, the teacher is required to set an effective feedback. Prompting-answer strategy is one of effective strategies to cover the students’ errors by omitting the correct form.

Dealing with the findings, some respondents assumed this strategy was an effective strategy. It was stated in the investigation of teachers’ perceptions while they implemented this strategy. T1 considered prompting-answer strategy was helpful for motivating students’ critical thinking and their bravery in expressing the ideas, especially in correcting their errors. Those included:

“I use oral corrective feedback by giving stimulus to guide them to find the correct form. I give various kinds of stimulus by asking some questions, by asking them to discuss the errors together, and also by giving the clue to facilitate their thinking easily. In my opinion, it also can be an effective way to boost their bravery in expressing the ideas.”

The similar perceptions were stated by T3 in following response below:
"I give the stimulus first. Then, I give them some questions to guide them in finding the concept. I also have special treatment. Sometimes I collect the errors without write their identities which made these errors. And I ask all of students to analyze and discuss these errors. I believe some students can find out the errors because the materials are familiar and I have explained it before."

She explained oral corrective feedback could be provided by giving some indicated questions. It could be more effective if the teacher set special treatment in applying this strategy. It depended on the teachers’ creativity in providing this strategy effectively.

In the other hand, she also considered this strategy could face recursive errors which the students have heard and recognized the concept before.

There was another teacher which had additional perceptions in providing this strategy. T6 assumed the teachers had to consider the errors before they applied this strategy. As following result below:

"I usually give the target form and give the stimulus the correction as well. It depends on the errors. If the students made errors which I ever give the solution or answer about those errors, I will push them to remember and find out the solution. I only stimulate them with the guided questions. I usually show and share to the other students by asking them to discuss and to find out the correct form."

"
According to those perceptions, she noticed prompting-answer accurately overcome students’ errors moreover when the students are in process of understanding the concept.

T2 also added T6’s perception which explained oral corrective feedback was better to be used to respond recursive errors as follows:

“I will also avoid giving the correct form when they produce recursive errors which they repeatedly do it again and again.”

c. Timing

To find out data of this indicator, the researcher delivered 2 basic questions to the respondents. The respondents assumed 2 timing of corrective feedback: Immediate and delayed corrective feedback.

1. Immediate feedback

Immediate feedback is a timing of oral corrective feedback which the teacher gives their feedback immediately. Some of respondents stated to choose this timing by considering some reasons. As findings on T3’s investigation below:

“In my opinion, when the errors happen in the process of teaching and learning in the class, it is better if I give correction immediately because they will focus more with the errors. They will never forget with the errors. They will be more responsive in responding the errors.”
She believed when the teachers directly gave feedback for the students’ errors, their feedback could be more effective as the students were aware with their errors. The students were more responsive to understand the feedback well.

The other respondent also added the first perception which stated immediate feedback was an effective feedback for responding students’ errors. The T6 chose to provide feedback immediately to obtain their attentions so that students understood what teacher’s feedback is. As following explanation below:

“I directly respond the errors and ask the other students to analyze together. I respond immediately because it is to get their attention when feedback is being given by me.”

T5 also asserted that:

“In my opinion, it will be more effective when they give immediately. It is chosen because they are in high awareness to get feedback from the teacher.”

Based on the explanations of those respondents, immediate feedback was a way in correcting students’ errors which aimed to obtain their awareness or attention so that the students could understand well what the teacher corrected.

There was specific important information obtained from T4’s perception below:

“Actually it depends on the process or product of the students’ errors. When they naturally made simple
errors in process of activity I will give correction immediately.”

It explained the teacher should consider the learning activity whether this errors occur in process or product of learning activity. If the errors happened in the process of teaching and learning, it was better when the teachers gave immediate feedback.

2. Delayed feedback

The second timing in providing oral corrective feedback is delayed feedback. It is kind of timing which the teacher delayed feedback until later. It is given to face errors which were situated after communicative interaction is finished.

The findings of teachers’ perceptions stated that delayed feedback was used to set out the students’ interaction in producing some utterances but the teachers are disposed to let the communication until finished before they asked the students to analyze the errors. The teacher T4 assumed as follows:

“I delay the feedback when the communication is still running, because when I directly give feedback, it can annoy students’ attention in producing English utterances.”

Another perception was from T1 as follows:

“Delayed feedback will not disturb their attention when they are saying or producing some sentences.”
Additionally, the teacher delayed feedback in order to develop the students’ sensitivity in finding errors from the other students’ utterances. There was another finding found by researcher in interviewing the teachers. T1 believed this feedback was to stimulate them to be more sensitive in finding the errors and in explaining the correct form. Those included:

“I really often delay the correct form. I usually restrain my feedback and give chances them first to find the errors by themselves. I ensure if they have chances to look for sensitively and think deeply, they will be trained to respond the errors well.”

T2 also added that:

“I actually prefer to choose delay the correct form, because actually I want to stimulate their critical thinking although it is difficult enough for them in finding the errors or correct form and it will be more challenging for the students.”

Delayed feedback was also used by considering the activity whether errors happened in process or product of teaching and learning. Dealing with the findings of T4’s perception as follows:

“If they make errors in the product of the activity, I will delay and ask the others to discuss those errors and to think the correction after all students finished.”

Both of the options of timing explained any specific aim for each option whether the errors occurred in the process or product of learning activity.
2. Observation results

All data were collected by recording the respondents’ teaching practice which permitted the researcher inside. The researcher used observation sheet and camera as aids of recording the data. The observation sheet was an instrument to record teaching and learning process by considering the indicators. There were several indicators included in this sheet: type of error, strategy, type, timing, and provider of oral corrective feedback.

Actually, the researcher deeply investigated the implementation of oral corrective feedback which was found in teaching and learning process. All of data was obtained from all respondents’ teaching and learning process.

The data were analyzed by counting the score of sub-indicators. Then, those were calculated to find out the percentage for each sub-indicator. The formula of calculating percentage is:

\[ P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100\% \]

Where:

P: Percentage of each statement
F: The score of each indicator
N: The total score

After calculating the percentage, the data were interpreted into Likert-scale. Thus, the data were finished to be displayed and concluded.
a. Types of errors

There was a table which explained the data which were analyzed to describe type of errors appeared in the class.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Morpho-syntactic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Phonological</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lexical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Table 4.1, there were 3 types of error which were given feedback in class observations. Morphology-syntactic error was around 20% that was low to be responded by the teachers. Phonological error was around 74% which was high to be given feedback by the teachers. Lexical error was only 4% which was very low to be correcting by the teachers.

1. Morphology-syntactic error

It was a kind of error when students produce or use the word order, tense and particle inappropriately. In the class, the learners were corrected when they produce some sentences in word order. Those were shown in following example below:

“Then, peel mangoes 6.”
The students also produced sentences which were wrong tense. They inappropriately used the predicates (verb or be) by adjusting with the subject. These included:

“Cat have a tail.”

“Anton realize that ...”

The following errors below indicated that the students had difficulty in mentioning past verb by considering the adverb of time. These errors were:

“She call me, 2 days ago.”

“They spend this holiday in Yogyakarta, 2 months ago.”

The learners also produced English by missing some particles. As following example below:

“I am diligent student.”

“Marita is best friend.”

2. Phonological error

The students’ utterances were in wrong pronunciation. The learners mispronounced words (stress and intonation). This error was the highest error found in teaching and learning process. It was indicated to happen when the students started to say some new words (new vocabularies which just now they hear or find). These were some examples of words which the students mispronounce as follows:

soldier  cat
The students were difficult to pronounce those words appropriately as they still communicate with the first language. Moreover, they are still junior high students who do not have a lot of experiences in learning English as subject matter.

3. Lexical error

Lexical error was a kind of error which the learners used inappropriate vocabulary or they mixed English with the first language because of lack of lexical knowledge. This error was very low to be found in the class because many students were less confidence to say English with enough lexical mastery. Only a few students said English and they produced this error.

First, the learners used inappropriate vocabulary as follows:

“It has male”

“He sister cried with this condition”

Second, the students also mixed English with the first language when they wanted to say the word in English but they did not know. The examples of findings as follows:

“The crocodile was sangat stupid.”
b. Strategies of oral corrective feedback

The way of teachers in providing oral corrective feedback is called as strategy. Table 4.2 displays the data of strategy which occurred in the class as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Giving-answer</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>Very high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prompting-answer</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 4.2, the respondents were indicated to highly use giving-answer strategy (82%) when they faced errors in teaching and learning process. Prompting-answer strategy was also found in the class but it was very low (18%).

Concerning the data above, the researcher divides the strategy into 2 as follows:

1. Giving-answer strategy

Giving-answer strategy is a way of teacher in providing appropriate oral corrective feedback by giving direct answer or target form in responding students’ errors. This strategy was highly stated to be used by the respondents as effective strategy in minimizing errors of students’ utterances in EFL classroom.
The findings explained that the teachers used this strategy because many errors appeared in the class. Mostly, the errors were indicated from new material which the teachers just explained to the students. Specifically, it occurred when the students who were in high motivation directly tried to say (produce) some words/sentences before any explanation (the concept) from the teachers. Hence, they easily produced many errors. Therefore, the teachers responded those errors by applying giving-answer strategy.

Lack of experience from the students to hear those words made the teachers considered to use this strategy. In the class, the teachers set out the correct form to students in order to habituate them to produce some words correctly so they quickly understand the concept.

Additionally, there was a specific purpose they considered to use it in responding these errors. It was to emphasize the target form by measuring the errors as their difficulty in process of understanding the concept. Fostering the purpose, the researcher proved that the respondents considered to measure students’ difficulty in the class. The teachers analyzed the response of students when one of them incorrectly produced or wrote some words or sentences. They were not aware with the
errors they made. Based on this response, teachers considered to choose this strategy as an effective feedback to be applied.

2. Prompting-answer strategy

Prompting-answer strategy is a way of teachers to respond students’ errors which the teachers push the students’ critical thinking by giving some indications to find out the correct form. Encouraging the students by providing indications to clarify their understanding in correcting errors was a basic point of this strategy.

In the class, the teachers considered to use this strategy because they actually had got the explanation or correction about the errors which is called recursive error. Those errors were discussed by asking the other students to concern with the errors in order to guide them in finding correct form. Therefore, this strategy was extremely appropriate for emphasizing their understanding of such concept in language learning especially in Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL).

Depending on the table, this strategy was very low to be found (18%) as the students were still lack of confidence to respond the errors by considering the teachers’ stimulus, besides that English is also foreign language for them where they are lack of experience to use it in the class. Prompting-answer strategy was also rarely used by the teachers because most of
students were silent when they gave it in the class. Particularly, it was only an effective way in encouraging the students’ bravery in expressing the ideas and maximizing their understanding with the material.

c. Types of oral corrective feedback

The class observations also measured and analyzed the type of oral corrective feedback. Table 4.3 explains the types of oral corrective feedback used by the respondents as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Explicit correction</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Metalinguistic cue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clarification request</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Body language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table explained the highest type found in the class was explicit correction (50%), the second place was explicit correction
with metalinguistic explanation (27%), the third place was clarification request (15%), the fourth place was repetition (4%), the next place was recast (2%), and the latest place were metalinguistic cue (1%) and body language (1%).

Depending on the table, there are 7 types of oral corrective feedback committed in the class as follows:

1. Repetition

   The teachers noticed the errors by repeating the students’ utterance in rising intonation or stress of words error to focus the students' attention on the errors. The findings stated the errors and the teacher’s feedback happened as follows:

   S: “The tortoise go to the zoo...”
   T: “The tortoise GO to the zoo...”
   S: “The tortoise went to the zoo.”

   (Based on T2’s class observation)

   Dealing with the example, T2 repeated the students’ utterance by noticing student’s error which was inappropriate tense. Additionally, the other example of repetition was also found as follows:

   S: “Yesterday, he played a guitar with me.” (The underline word was in wrong pronunciation.)
   T: “Yesterday, he PLAYED a guitar with me.”
   S: “Ok sir, he played a guitar with me.”
(Based on T4’s class observation)

This conversation indicated that repetition occurred when a student was wrong in pronunciation.

2. Recast

The teacher responded the students’ error by reformulating all or part of their utterance. There was finding which showed recast in teaching and learning as follows:

S: “She is like swimming.”
T: “She likes…”
S: “She likes swimming.”

(Based on T6’s observation)

3. Explicit correction

Explicit correction is a correction which the teacher directly provides the correct form in responding students’ errors. Depending on the findings, the respondents commonly used this type to cover their difficulty in producing some words or sentences in correct concept. These included:

S: “I not like cooking fried rice.”
T: “I do not, Ayu.”
S: “Oh...I do not like cooking fried rice.”

(Based on T6’s observation)
4. Explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation

The teacher responds students’ erroneous utterance by directly providing the correct form and adding some explanations to maximize students’ understanding with the concept. There was a conversation which indicated this type as follows:

S: “I prepare some ingredients.”

T: “Prepare some ingredients. If you want to tell the process of how to make something, you have to use imperative sentence which omitting the subject and only using verb 1 in the beginning of the sentence.”

(Based on T3’s class observation)

5. Metalinguistic cue

The teacher provides only the explanation to indicate the errors or asks questions regarding the correctness of the students’ error, without explicitly providing the target form. There was a finding which indicated this type found in the class, as follows:

S: “He say, run! run! run!”

T: “In telling fable, you have to use verb 2.”

(Based on T2’s class observation)
6. Clarification request

The teacher provides questions to stimulate the students’ awareness with their erroneous utterance or to clarify the student’s answer which was not unclear. It usually includes phrases such as “Pardon me”, “What?”, “Is it right?”, “What do you mean?” etc. There was an example conversation to prove this type as follows:

S: “Cat have a tail.”
T: “Is it right?”

(Based on T1’s class observation)

7. Body language

The teacher responds the students’ errors by using a facial expression or a body movement to notice the errors occurred. There was a finding which indicated this type observed as follows:

S: “Then, it jump into the pit.”
T: “Mmm.. (Teacher shakes her head which signals NO)"

(Based on T2’s class observation)

d. Timing of oral corrective feedback

Based on the results, table 4.4 displays 2 options of timing in providing oral corrective feedback as follows:
Table 4.4

Timing of oral corrective feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Delayed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Depending on the table, immediate corrective feedback was highly indicated (74%) in the class. Delayed corrective feedback was also indicated in the class, but it was still low (26%).

Actually, oral corrective feedback can be provided immediately after errors have been made, or it can be delayed until later, after the communicative activity is finished.

1. Immediate corrective feedback

Teacher provides immediate corrective feedback after errors are found in learning activity. Actually, the process of learning is a basic factor which can naturally indicate students to do many errors.

Depending on the findings, the teachers responded errors happened in process of learning by providing feedback immediately. The teachers immediately responded the errors by directly giving the target form or providing some indications to guide them to find out the correct form. It was to advance their
understanding with the concepts correctly when they learn new material.

They also considered to immediately give feedback when they want to initially emphasize their understanding with the form (focus on form). It began when the teachers wanted to maximize their understanding about the form. Actually, it encouraged the accuracy of language learning.

Additionally, the teachers also applied this feedback in facing some errors which did not need any explanation in providing feedback such as phonological errors. Moreover, it applied when the students mispronounced some words then the teacher directly respond.

Thus, the teachers considered to provide immediate feedback in facing errors in process of learning activity, setting out the students’ understanding of form, and facing errors which did not need any explanation in providing feedback.

2. Delayed corrective feedback

The teacher delays their correction until the communicative activity has been finished. Furthermore, the teachers delayed their correction when they found errors while the students were performing their product in the class activity. Actually, the teachers wanted to focus on their development of
fluency. The teachers initially let their communication without disrupt their process of expressing ideas.

In the other side, errors also happened in the class not only in the process of learning but actually in the product of learning activity. Basically, the teachers considered to give the students an equal chance in presenting their product, so the teachers delayed to be more fair for them.

The other findings also showed that the teachers delayed their feedback in order to minimizing errors which needed some explanations such as lexical and morpho-syntactic errors. Substantively, the teachers wanted to generalize the feedback (inform to all students).

In conclusion, the teachers delayed the feedback in order to set out the communication fluency, respond errors in the product of learning activity, and face errors which need some explanations such as lexical or morpho-syntactic errors.

e. Providers of oral corrective feedback

Dealing with the participants involved in communicative interaction in the class, Table 4.5 shows the data of possible providers in the class as follows:
Table 4.5

Providers of oral corrective feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Providers</th>
<th>Total score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher-correction</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Peer-correction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-correction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Very low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on table 4.5, the findings reveal teacher-correction has the highest score around 83 (72%), peer-correction is 28 (25%) in the second place, and self-correction has score around 3 (3%).

There are 3 possible providers of oral corrective feedback in the class. Those included:

1. Teacher-correction

   Absolutely, Teacher-correction occurs when the teacher finds the errors and tries to correct those errors because no one knows the errors’ placement and the solution, except the teacher.

   Dealing with the findings, the teachers tried to explain the errors directly or giving some indications to their students when the students could not find out the errors and define the solution by themselves. Furthermore, most of them were still lack of confidence and bravery to express their ideas for responding the errors. Hence, the teachers gave correction to overcome these situations.
2. Peer-correction

Peer-correction happens when one student makes errors and the other students can correct the errors. Based on the findings, the other students directly responded the errors which were produced from their peers in the class. It indicated the students had good understanding to detect and correct errors from the other students. Consequently, it can improve their ability and confidence in expressing their ideas.

3. Self-correction

It occurs when the students realize they make errors and repair it by themselves. Depending on the class observation result, it was possible to be found in junior high students. It depended on the students’ understanding and their awareness with the errors they made.
B. Discussion

Dealing with the interview results, there are some roles of oral corrective feedback for the students, teacher and language learning. Firstly, it has various roles for the students in EFL classroom, those are to measure the depth of the students’ understanding, to encourage students’ motivation for being active as Hyland and Hyland stated in Chapter II, to find out and solve their difficulty after they know how far they understand the materials, to maximize their understanding the concept of English in written or spoken language, and to encourage the students’ motivation to produce English appropriately.

Secondly, oral corrective feedback also has significant roles for teacher as provider. Those are to improve teachers’ expertise such as experience and ability as corrector so they can naturally encourage their awareness with the students’ condition as Alqahtani asserted in Chapter II. Consequently, the teachers are demanded to apply oral corrective feedback appropriately and maximize its roles in correcting students’ errors in EFL classroom.

Lastly, there are two basic roles in improving language learning such language accuracy and fluency in EFL classroom based on the teachers’ perceptions. Their language accuracy reflects in improving language fluency. It happens when the students have good concepts of the materials and naturally habituate their utterances in English. Thus, the students automatically have progress in fluency.
All of roles which aim for improving students, teacher, and language learning are stated by some experts who are in Chapter II of this research. The findings of interview reveal positive perceptions from all respondents that they stated its roles above. The specific description can be analyzed from Chart 4.1 as follows:

Chart 4.1

The roles of oral corrective feedback

In the interview result, the teachers also believed oral corrective feedback becomes an effective way for minimizing students’ errors through the strategy in the class. The teachers described 2 strategy of oral corrective
feedback (as Ferreira, Moore, & Mellish stated in Chapter II): 1) giving-answer strategy and 2) prompting-answer strategy. Chart 4.2 explains specific concept of those strategy as follows:

Chart 4.2

Strategies of oral corrective feedback

- **Giving-answer strategy**
  - Facing new errors
  - Habituating the students to produce correct target form

- **Prompting-answer strategy**
  - Facing recursive errors
  - Encouraging students’ critical thinking and bravery

Some of respondents stated to use giving answer strategy as an effective way in recognizing new material so that students can easily understand and use English in teaching and learning process. Some of them also asserted to use prompting-answer strategy in order to stimulate the students’ critical thinking and bravery to express their ideas.
The interview result also describes the teachers’ perception of the effective timing in providing oral corrective feedback. Many experts also defined the timing of oral corrective feedback in Chapter II of this research.

In observation result, the respondents’ teaching practices were observed by the researcher to investigate the implementation of oral corrective feedback in EFL classroom. 114 errors were responded by the respondents in the class. Actually, those are described into 3 types of error: Morphology-syntactic error, Phonological error, and Lexical error. Those errors were also asserted by Mackey, Gass and McDonough (2000, cited in Mendez & Cruz, 2012:68) in Chapter II of this research.

Depending on those errors which naturally happened in the class, the teachers respond by setting 2 appropriate strategies. These strategies are giving-answer and prompting answer strategy as Ferreira, Moore, & Mellish (2007:392) stated in Chapter II of this research. In the class, the most teachers try to stimulate their students’ response by giving such guided questions or giving some clues as indications. Unfortunately, the most of students were indicated to be silent. Indicatively, those conditions stated that the students are low in confidence or in understanding. Hence, the teachers used this strategy in order to cover their difficulty.

Actually, prompting-answer strategy is to push students to notice a language error in their response and to repair the error for themselves (Ferreira, Moore, & Mellish, 2007:392 in Chapter II of this research). This strategy was less effective to be used in responding junior high school
students’ response because they are still lack of understanding whole concept of English as foreign language. Only a few students were participated in giving their responses with the errors happened in the class. It is proven where students are not confidence to respond or they do not understand well about the concept of target language so they cannot give respond well.

Dealing with the observation results, there are 7 specific types of oral corrective feedback. Table 4.3 (in Chapter III) explains the highest type found in the class was explicit correction, the second place was explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation, the third place was clarification request, the fourth place was repetition, the next place was recast, and the latest place were metalinguistic cue and body language.

In the class, repetition was indicated as one of oral corrective feedback which teacher repeats the errors by rising intonation so that it focuses the students’ attentions as Doughty & Varela (1998) stated in Chapter II. Recast was also found which the teachers respond the students’ error by reformulating all or part of their utterance as Sheen (2011) stated in Chapter II. Explicit correction which the teacher directly provides the correct form in responding students’ errors as Ferreira, Moore, & Mellish (2007:392) stated in Chapter II was also indicated. Then, explicit correction with metalinguistic explanation which the teacher responds students’ erroneous utterance by directly providing the correct form and adding some explanations to maximize students’ understanding with the concept as Sheen
(2011) stated in Chapter II was also analyzed. Basically, all of those types provided the target form and did not ask the students to find by themselves.

The other types were also observed by the researcher in the class. Firstly, meta-linguistic cue which the teacher provides only the explanation to indicate the errors or asks questions regarding the correctness of the students’ error, without explicitly providing the target form as Ferreira, Moore, & Mellish (2007:392) stated in Chapter II was indicated. Secondly, clarification request which provides questions to stimulate the students’ awareness with their erroneous utterance or to clarify the student’s answer which was not unclear as Ferreira, Moore, & Mellish (2007:392) stated in Chapter II was found. Lastly, Body language which responds the students’ errors by using a facial expression or a body movement to notice the errors occurred as Yao (2000) stated in Chapter II was also analyzed by the researcher. Actually, those types give the students any indication with the errors. Those are used to push the students’ attention and critical thinking to find out the target form. Consequently, the researcher included them into prompting-answer strategy.

Based on those explanations, the researcher distinguishes the types of oral corrective feedback into 2 basic strategies (Ferreira, Moore, & Mellish, 2007:392) as follows:

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>Giving-answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the observation result, the researcher also indicated two timing of oral corrective feedback which teachers applied to maximize its roles in teaching and learning process. Teacher provides immediately corrective feedback after errors are indicated from students’ utterance or it can be delayed until communicative activity is finished as Mendez & Cruz (2012:67) stated in Chapter II.

Actually, the teachers’ timing of oral corrective feedback depends on some factors. The process of learning can naturally indicate students to do many errors. The teachers respond the errors situated in process of learning by providing immediate feedback. Teachers ask them to analyze the errors and provide the correct form in order to cover their difficulty in process of learning. Moreover, it is used when the teachers want to focus on form. They applied this timing in facing some errors which did not need any explanation, especially, in facing phonological errors.

The product of learning can also indicate students to produce errors in spoken or written language. In the findings, the respondents used delayed
feedback for facing errors in the product of learning activity in order to set out the students’ communicative interaction or focus on the students’ fluency. The teachers ask the students to point out the errors and to discuss together on order to find the correct form. The teachers also considered to delay feedback in facing errors which needed some explanations especially for facing lexica or morpho-syntactic errors. Hence, the teachers decide the appropriate timing for correcting the students’ errors.

The latest indicator which the researcher collected in class observation is providers of oral corrective feedback. Considering the participants in the class, the possible correctors of providers of oral corrective feedback are divided into 3 points. Those are teacher-correction, peer-correction, and self-correction as Mendez & Cruz (2012:68) stated in Chapter II of this research.

The findings stated teacher-correction was dominant in scoring. It indicates the teacher has central role in teaching and learning process especially in EFL classroom. It also indicates they cannot force their students to correct errors by themselves as much as possible. Only a few students had good understanding and confidence to correct errors. The last is self-correction which they could realize and correct errors by themselves.

As a result, the findings asserted the relations of teachers’ perceptions and the actual practice of oral corrective feedback on the strategies and the timing. Firstly, chart 4.3 presents the correlation based on the strategy as follows:
It indicates all teachers’ perceptions were observed in the class especially for strategies they applied. Additionally, there is a point of prompting-answer strategy that was also found in the class observations. Hence, the teachers’ perceptions have strong reliability so that those can be found in actual practices as stated in Chapter IV of this research.

Secondly, the findings also stated the relations of teachers’ perceptions and the actual practices of oral corrective feedback on timing aspect. Chart 4.4 explains as follows:
Based on Chart 4.4, Several points of teachers’ perceptions in immediate or delayed feedback were committed in the class such facing errors situated in process of learning (immediate), setting out the students’ communications, and facing errors situated in product of learning activity (delayed). Two points could not be found in the teaching practice such getting students’ attention (immediate) and improving students’ sensitivity in finding errors and correct forms (delayed). There are also additional points which
occurred in its implementations such facing errors which do not need any explanations such as phonological errors, setting out the students’ understanding of form (immediate) and facing errors which need explanations such as lexical or morpho-syntactic errors (delayed).